

## Moderation Feedback -Central

**Assessment Panel:**

History

**Qualification area**

**Subject(s) and Level(s)  
included in this report**

History: Higher, Int 2, Int 1, Access 3

## Central Moderation

### General comments on central moderation activity

The vast majority of scripts moderated were clearly marked and included comments about the answers which were very helpful to both the candidates and the moderators.

For Higher, a considerable number of essays had formed part of the “Prelim” and, since the standard for the Internal and External, Assessments are identical, this was very acceptable. Candidates are allowed a maximum of one hour for Internal Assessment essay answer, but if their essay is part of a Prelim they are allowed only about 40 minutes. Nevertheless, most candidates clearly achieved the necessary standard within that time.

There were some good examples of revisiting being used to tackle problems such as weak essay introductions or conclusions.

Intermediate scripts were also clearly marked to the national standards, but there were some problems with weak source evaluation and comparison answers.

Access 3 scripts were moderated for the first time. Most of them demonstrated that pupils had put a great deal of hard work into achieving the outcomes satisfactorily.

A number of centres submitted evidence which had been cross-marked. Moderators noted that this had the effect of applying the national standards more vigorously.

### Specific issues identified

There were a few problems caused by Higher candidates writing descriptive essays about the topic of the question rather than doing what the question asked. A small number of candidates missed the point of the question altogether and, for example, described the Liberal Reforms, 1906 – 1914 rather than evaluated their role in creating the Welfare state.

For Intermediate Source Evaluation questions, a number of candidates commented only on the content of the source and failed to consider authorship, bias and the date when the source was written.

There were a number of very weak Intermediate Source Comparison answers. Candidates should identify a point from one source and a comparative point from the second source and then explain the comparison they are making. It is not acceptable for candidates to write answers which summarise one source then the other source and finally to write a very generalised comment about comparison.

Centres presenting candidates for Access 3 work should pay a great deal of attention to the requirements of the Assessment. In particular, candidates must refer to a four Key Concepts in their answers and use four different sources of evidence (eg books, television programmes, computer programs, etc). These requirements are stated clearly in the Conditions and Arrangements and also in the NABs and they should be embedded in the work candidates undertake.

## Feedback to centres

The vast majority of centres are very well aware of the national standards and they apply these in their assessments. Consequently, the moderators' comments are simply to endorse the centres' assessments.

There were a few problems caused by Higher candidates writing descriptive essays about the topic of the question rather than doing what the question asked. A small number of candidates missed the point of the question altogether and, for example, described Liberal Reforms 1906 – 1914 rather than evaluated their role in the creating of the Welfare State.

For Intermediate Source Evaluation questions, a number of candidates commented only on the content of the source and failed to consider author, bias, date and when source was written.

There were a number of very weak Intermediate Source Comparison answers. Candidates should identify a point from one source and a comparative point from a second source and then explain the comparison they are making. It is not acceptable for candidates to write answers which summarise one source then the other source and finally

Centres presenting candidates for Access 3 work should pay a great deal of attention to the requirements of the Assessment. In particular, candidates must refer to four Key Concepts in their answers and use four different sources of evidence (eg books, television programmes, computer programs, etc). These requirements are stated clearly in the Conditions and Arrangements and also in the NABs and they should be embedded in the work candidates undertake.

Candidates are allowed to "re-visit" to bring them up to the required standard. However, "re-visiting" should be used to tackle scripts which are weak in only one outcome eg source comparison. Where scripts are weak in several outcomes, candidates should be re-assessed using a different NAB.

There are occasions where an individual script has been assessed generously. Centres should be wary of this since it could jeopardise the acceptability of their entire sample. This problem was significantly reduced in centres where cross marking had taken place.

There were very few centres where moderators decided that the assessments were "not acceptable". In these few cases the moderators collaborated in making that decision and identifying where there were areas of weakness. In those instances the moderator's comments are intended to be helpful in indicating what the centre could do to tackle the problem.

Revised NABs have been issued for the Higher Special Topic and centres should be careful to use these revised NABs. These revisions match revisions in the external assessment and, within time constraints, it will allow centres to use the NAB as part of a Prelim.

Revised NABs for Advanced Higher will be issued in the autumn of 2003. Again these revisions match the revisions in the external examination.

Revised NABs for Intermediate 2 will be issued to centres in the autumn of 2003. Again, they have been aligned to the external examination and centres can combine NABs to create a Prelim.

Centres should be careful to use only revised NABs for future Internal Assessments.